Interpellation.	Answer.
April 1918, through his Commanding Officer, Lieut. Col. Kitson of the 79th Carnatic Infantry, and a subsequent one in the month of January 1919, for the registry in his name of a portion of this tank-bed and, if so, will they be pleased to state how they have disposed of the said applications?	Padmanabhapuram, for disposal. These related to ten acres of this tank-bed land.
(iv) Did the Government receive other applications for the registry of the said tank-bed; and, if so, how many were received, what were the prices offered, and how were those applications disposed of?	(iv) No.
(v) If it is on concession rate that this tank-bed was registered in the name of the present owner, will the Government be pleased to state if such treatment has been meted out to any other person in the matter of the registry of tank-beds within the commanded area, and how many acres were thus disposed of?	(v) No concession in the matter of *tharavila* appears to have been shown in any case of registry of tank beds.
(vi) Are the Government aware of their orders Nos. P. W. 2845, dated 6th April 1908 and 7203/L. R. & F., dated 12th July 1913, and also their letter No. 2387/L. R., dated 30th March 1915, clearly directing that the tank-beds, rendered unnecessary through the completion of the Kodayar Project, should be sold in public auction, that the sale-proceeds should go to the head of capital and reduce *pro tanto* the capital outlay on the project, and that the yearly direct receipts in the form of water cess and the new taxes on the Government lands within the commanded area, sold and converted into wet lands, should all go towards calculating the net return from the project? If so, will they be pleased to explain their action in disposing of some of the tank-beds otherwise than by public auction and thus not realising their maximum value?	(vi) The Government are aware of the orders referred to. Where Government have deviated from the policy laid down in those orders, the deviation has been made for reasons considered adequate by them.
11. (i) Are the Government aware—	*Secretary Mr. K. Narayanan Pandalay.*
(*a*) that a Bill called "the Nanjinad Vellala Bill" was introduced by the Government in the Legislative Council in the year 1090;	11. (i) (*a*) to (*d*). Yes.
(*b*) that after passing the Select Committee stage it was withdrawn with a view to re-introduce it with its scope enlarged; and	
(*c*) that since its withdrawal in 1092, several petitions and memorials have been submitted to the Government by the members of the Nanjinad Vellala community?	
(*d*) Are the Government aware of the representations made in the 15th and 16th Sessions of the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly by Messrs. M. Thandavamoorti Pillai and A. Thanumalaya Perumal Pillai, elected members of the Tovala taluk, and the Dewan's reply thereto?	
(ii) Will the Government be pleased to state the cause of this long delay in re-introducing the Bill as promised and whether they are in a position to re-introduce the Bill without further delay?	(ii) The delay is due to the difficulty experienced by the Government in correctly gauging the feelings of the community in the matter. To meet this difficulty the Government propose to appoint a Committee to make the necessary enquiry and re-draft the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly